UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,267	04/22/2005	Pierre Nicolas	3712036.00600	1492
29157 7590 08/20/2010 K&L Gates LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 1135	60600	TRAN LIEN, THUY		
CHICAGO, IL 60690			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1781	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/532,267	NICOLAS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Lien T. Tran	1781		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims	x parte Quayle, 1900 O.D. 11, 40	30 0.0. 213.		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,6-9,13-17 and 20 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,6-9, 13-17 and 20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction in the original sheet (s). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P	ate		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:				

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 13-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In the amendment filed 6/14/10, applicant amends claims 1,9,14,16 to add the limitation "at least one proteinase, at least one xylanase". The new limitation is not supported by the original disclosure. At least one means one and more; the specification discloses adding proteinase and xylanase. However, there is no disclosure of adding more than one proteinase and more than one xylanase.

Claims 1,3,6-9,13-17,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pruden et al (US2003/0072862A1) in view Huang et al. (WO 02/39820A2) and applicant's admission of prior art.

Pruden et al disclose a bakery composition comprising at least one enzyme selected from an alpha amylase, protease and pentosanase. Pruden et al teach a method of extending the shelf life of the bakery product by adding the bakery composition to the dough or batter. The dough is baked whereupon the extended shelf life is manifested in the baked product. Non-limiting useful examples of the bakery products include cookies, biscuit, waffles, pancake, any cereal based food products etc.... The bakery products are made by use of a leavening agent or without leavening agent. The leavening agent includes sodium bicarbonate. The effective amount of the

enzyme ranges from about .21-6 parts by weight of the dough. (see paragraphs 0014,0016, 0017, 0027, 0024,0050)

Pruden et al do not disclose wafer having the humidity as claimed, enzyme in units, the origin of the amylase.

Huang et al disclose a wafer having a humidity of 2%. (see page 9)

Applicant discloses on page 6 of the specification that a typical batter used in the manufacture of commercial flat wafer contains 40-50% flour and common formulations may also comprise at least one of the following ingredients: fat, oi, sugar, sodium bicarbonate, yeast etc..

Pruden et al disclose the bakery composition comprising at least one enzyme can be added to many different types of bakery products including cookies, biscuit. Wafer is known in the art and defined in the dictionary as small, thin flat cookie or biscuit. Thus, if the composition is added to cookies, it can be added to wafer because wafer is a type of cookie. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the composition to wafer when desiring to extend the shelf life of the wafer. The generation of in-situ modified starch and the forming of soluble dextrin is an inherent result from the addition of the enzyme before baking. Wafer is known in the art to have low humidity as shown by Huang et al. When a wafer is formed, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to make the wafer to have a humidity that is appropriate for such product. It would also have been obvious to add ingredient such as gassing agent because such additive is conventional for wafer as disclosed in the specification. Page 13 of the specification, the concentration of enzyme can range from .00078-.4%.

Art Unit: 1781

Pruden discloses the amount of enzyme can be from .21-6 part. The process of forming a wafer is so well known in the art and would have been obvious to one skilled in the art when making a wafer. It would have been obvious to obtain the enzyme from any source; all the sources claimed are well known in the art. The new limitation does not define over Pruden. In paragraph 0057, Pruden discloses that the enzymes include amylase, protease and pentosanase and mixtures thereof. Thus, the enzymes include all amylase, protease and pentosanase. the pentosanase inlcudes xylanase.

In the response filed 6/14/10, applicant argues Pruden et al do not disclose the enzyme units as claimed and the amount of .21-6 parts in Pruden is less than the amount claimed. This argument is not persuasive. While Pruden does not disclose the enzyme units, the concentration of enzyme disclosed in Pruden falls within the range of enzyme concentration disclosed in the instant specification. Example 2 on page 13 discloses amounts of enzyme ranging from .00078-.4%; the percent of enzyme disclosed in Pruden falls within the range disclosed. Since the enzyme in Pruden is the same enzyme as claimed and the amounts fall within the range disclosed, it is inherent the enzyme units are within the broad range claimed in absence of evidence showing otherwise.

As to the lack of disclosure of the enzyme units in Huang, the reference is only relied upon to show the conventional humidity level of wafer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1408. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,267 Page 5

Art Unit: 1781

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monday, August 16, 2010

/Lien T Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1781